

A POSTERIORI ERROR BOUNDS FOR DISCONTINUOUS GALERKIN METHODS FOR QUASILINEAR PARABOLIC PROBLEMS

EMMANUIL H. GEORGOULIS AND OMAR LAKKIS

ABSTRACT. We derive a posteriori error bounds for a quasilinear parabolic problem, which is approximated by the hp -version interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method (IPDG). The error is measured in the energy norm. The theory is developed for the semidiscrete case for simplicity, allowing to focus on the challenges of a posteriori error control of IPDG space-discretizations of strictly monotone quasilinear parabolic problems. The a posteriori bounds are derived using the elliptic reconstruction framework, utilizing available a posteriori error bounds for the corresponding steady-state elliptic problem.

1. INTRODUCTION

Discontinuous Galerkin (DG) methods [Bak77, Whe78, Arn82], have enjoyed substantial development in recent years. For parabolic problems DG methods are interesting due to their good local conservation properties as well as due to their block-diagonal mass matrices.

This work is concerned with the derivation of a posteriori error bounds for the space-discrete interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method (IPDG) for quasilinear parabolic problems with strictly monotone non-linearities of Lipschitz growth.

A posteriori error bounds for h -version DG methods are derived in [KP03, KP07, BHL03, HSW07] and for DG-in-space parabolic problems in [SW05, EP05, YC06, GL08, EV09]. The contribution of this work is twofold:

- the derivation of a posteriori energy-norm error bounds for IPDG methods for quasilinear parabolic problems, and
- the resulting a posteriori bounds are explicit with respect to the local elemental polynomial degree.

A key tool in our a posteriori error analysis is the *elliptic reconstruction technique* [MN03, LM06, GL08]. Roughly speaking, in the elliptic reconstruction framework the error is split into a *parabolic* and an *elliptic* part, respectively. In the interest of being explicit with respect to the dependence of the a posteriori error bounds in the elemental polynomial degree p , we restrict the presentation to quadrilateral elements of tensor-product type (cf. Remark 3.7).

2. MODEL PROBLEM AND THE IPDG METHOD

Let Ω be a bounded open (curvilinear) polygonal domain with Lipschitz boundary $\partial\Omega$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$. For $\omega \subset \Omega$, we consider the standard spaces $L^2(\omega)$ (whose norm is denoted by $\|\cdot\|_\omega$ for brevity), $H^1(\omega)$ and $H_0^1(\omega)$, whose norm will be denoted by $\|\cdot\|_1$, along with its dual $H^{-1}(\omega)$, with norm $\|\cdot\|_{-1}$. For brevity, the standard inner product on $L^2(\Omega)$ will be denoted by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and the corresponding norm by $\|\cdot\|$.

We also define the spaces $L^2(0, T, X)$, $X \in \{L^2(\omega), H^{\pm 1}(\omega)\}$ and $L^\infty(0, T, L^2(\Omega))$, consisting of all measurable functions $v : [0, T] \rightarrow X$, for which $\|v\|_{L^2(0, T; X)} := (\int_0^T \|v(t)\|_X^2 dt)^{1/2} < +\infty$ and $\|v\|_{L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))} := \text{ess sup}_{t \in [0, T]} \|v(t)\|$. (The differentials in the integrals with respect to t are suppressed for brevity throughout this work.)

We identify function $v \in [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $v : t \rightarrow X$ and we denote $v(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$, for $v \in [0, T] \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

For $t \in (0, T]$, we consider the problem of finding a function u satisfying

$$(1) \quad u_t(t, x) - \nabla \cdot (a(t, x, |\nabla u(t, x)|) \nabla u(t, x)) = f(t, x) \quad \text{in } (0, T] \times \Omega,$$

where $f \in L^\infty(0, T; L^2(\Omega))$ and a a scalar uniformly continuous function, subject to initial condition $u(0, x) = u_0(x)$ on $\{0\} \times \Omega$, for $u_0 \in L^2(\Omega)$, and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions on $[0, T] \times \partial\Omega$.

We assume that the non-linearity a in equation (1) is of strongly monotone type with Lipschitz growth so that there exist positive constants $\underline{a}$ and $\bar{a}$ such that the following inequalities hold:

$$(2) \quad |a(t, x, |y|)y - a(t, x, |z|)z| \leq \bar{a}|y - z|$$

$$(3) \quad (a(t, x, |y|)y - a(t, x, |z|)z) \cdot (y - z) \geq \underline{a}|y - z|^2,$$

for all vectors $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and all $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \bar{\Omega}$.

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a shape-regular subdivision of Ω into disjoint closed quadrilateral elements $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}$. We assume that $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}$ are constructed via C^∞ -diffeomorphisms with non-singular Jacobian $F_\kappa : (-1, 1)^d \rightarrow \kappa$, so as to ensure $\bar{\Omega} = \cup_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \bar{\kappa}$.

For $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{Q}_p(\hat{\kappa})$ is the set of all tensor-product polynomials on $(-1, 1)^d$ of degree p in each variable and let

$$(4) \quad S^p := \{v \in L^2(\Omega) : v|_{F_\kappa} \in \mathcal{Q}_p(\hat{\kappa}), \kappa \in \mathcal{T}\},$$

be the (discontinuous) *finite element space*. Let Γ be the union of all $(d-1)$ -dimensional element faces e associated with the subdivision $\mathcal{T}$ (including the boundary). Let also $\Gamma_{\text{int}} := \Gamma \setminus \partial\Omega$, so that $\Gamma = \partial\Omega \cup \Gamma_{\text{int}}$.

Let κ^+, κ^- be two (generic) elements sharing a face $e := \kappa^+ \cap \kappa^- \subset \Gamma_{\text{int}}$ with respective outward normal unit vectors $\mathbf{n}^+$ and $\mathbf{n}^-$ on e . For $q : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, let $q^\pm := q|_{e \cap \partial\kappa^\pm}$ and $\phi^\pm := \phi|_{e \cap \partial\kappa^\pm}$, and set

$$\{q\}|_e := \frac{1}{2}(q^+ + q^-), \quad \{\phi\}|_e := \frac{1}{2}(\phi^+ + \phi^-),$$

$$[q]|_e := q^+ \mathbf{n}^+ + q^- \mathbf{n}^-, \quad [\phi]|_e := \phi^+ \cdot \mathbf{n}^+ + \phi^- \cdot \mathbf{n}^-;$$

if $e \subset \partial\kappa \cap \partial\Omega$, we set $\{\phi\}|_e := \phi^+$ and $[q]|_e := q^+ \mathbf{n}^+$. Finally, we introduce the *meshsize* $h : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $h(x) = \text{diam } \kappa$, if $x \in \kappa \setminus \partial\kappa$ and $h(x) = \{h\}$, if $x \in \Gamma$.

Consider the IPDG semi-linear form $B(\cdot, \cdot) : S^p \times S^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, introduced in [HRS05] for the solution of the corresponding steady-state problem, defined by

$$(5) \quad B(w, v) := \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \int_\kappa \alpha(w) \cdot \nabla v \, dx + \int_\Gamma (\theta \{a(t, x, h^{-1}|[w])| \nabla v\} \cdot [w] - \{\alpha(w)\} \cdot [v] + \sigma[w] \cdot [v]) \, ds,$$

where $\alpha(w) := a(t, \cdot, |\nabla w|) \nabla w$, $w \in H^1(\Omega) + S^p$, for $\theta \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, with the function $\sigma : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ defined piecewise by $\sigma|_e := C_\sigma p^2 / (h|_e)$, for some sufficient

large constant $C_\sigma > 0$. The corresponding energy norm $|||\cdot|||$ is defined $|||w||| := \left(\sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \|\nabla w\|_\kappa^2 + \int_\Gamma \sigma[w]^2 ds \right)^{1/2}$, for $w \in H^1(\Omega) + S^p$. The (spatially semidiscrete) *interior penalty discontinuous Galerkin method* (IPDG) for the initial/boundary value model problem reads:

$$(6) \text{ find } U : (0, T] \rightarrow S^p \text{ such that } \langle U_t, V \rangle + B(U, V) = \langle f, V \rangle \quad \forall t \in (0, T], V \in S^p.$$

3. A POSTERIORI ERROR BOUNDS

For $w \in H^1(\Omega) + S^p$, and $T > 0$, we define the norm $|||w|||_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} := \left(\int_0^T |||w|||^2 \right)^{1/2}$, $t > 0$. We shall derive a posteriori bounds for the error $|||u - U|||_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))}$.

3.1. Definition (elliptic reconstruction). Let U be the (semi-discrete) solution to the problem (6) and fix $t \in [0, T]$. We define the *elliptic reconstruction* $w \equiv w(t) \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ of U to be the solution to the elliptic problem

$$(7) \quad \langle \alpha(w), \nabla v \rangle = \langle g, v \rangle \quad \forall v \in H_0^1(\Omega),$$

where $g \equiv g(t)$ is given by $g := -AU + f - \Pi f$, with $\Pi : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow S^p$ is the orthogonal L^2 -projection operator onto S^p and $A \equiv A(t) : S^p \rightarrow S^p$ is the discrete operator defined by

$$(8) \quad \text{for } Z \in S^p, \quad \langle -AZ, V \rangle = B(Z, V) \quad \forall V \in S^p.$$

The construction of w and that of AZ are both well defined in view of the elliptic problem's unique solvability and the Riesz representation, respectively.

3.2. Remark. The key property of the construction in Definition 3.1 is that U is the IPDG solution of an elliptic problem with analytical solution w . Namely, for each fixed $t \in [0, T]$ it satisfies

$$(9) \quad \text{find } U \in S^p \text{ such that } B(U, V) = \langle g, V \rangle \quad \forall V \in S^p.$$

We can now decompose the error as follows:

$$(10) \quad U - u = \rho - \epsilon, \text{ with } \rho := w - u, \text{ and } \epsilon := w - U,$$

where $w \equiv w(t)$ denotes the elliptic reconstruction of $U \equiv U(t)$, $t \in [0, T]$.

3.3. Lemma (differential error relation). *Let $u, w, U, e, \rho, \epsilon$ as above. Then, for all $v \in H_0^1(\Omega)$, we have*

$$(11) \quad \langle e_t, v \rangle + \langle \alpha(w) - \alpha(u), \nabla v \rangle = 0.$$

Proof We have

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \langle e_t, v \rangle + \langle \alpha(w) - \alpha(u), \nabla v \rangle = \langle U_t, v \rangle + \langle \alpha(w), \nabla v \rangle - \langle f, v \rangle \\ & = \langle U_t, v \rangle + \langle g, v \rangle - \langle f, v \rangle = \langle U_t, v \rangle + \langle -AU, v \rangle - \langle \Pi f, v \rangle \\ & = \langle U_t, \Pi v \rangle + \langle -AU, \Pi v \rangle - \langle f, \Pi v \rangle = 0, \end{aligned}$$

using (1), (7) and the properties of the L^2 -projection, respectively. $\square$

We consider further the decomposition of U into *conforming* and *non-conforming* (discontinuous) parts $U = U^c + U^d$, where $U^c \in S^p \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ and $U^d := U - U^c \in S^p$. Note that there are many ways of performing this decomposition (e.g., by projecting U onto the conforming space) whereof the specific nature remains at our disposal until further.

We also use the shorthand notation $e^c := U^c - u$ and $\epsilon^c := w - U^c$; note that $e^c = \rho - \epsilon^c$, $e = e^c + U^d$ and that $e^c \in H_0^1(\Omega)$.

3.4. Theorem (abstract a posteriori energy-error estimate). *With u , U , U^d , e , and ϵ as defined above, the following error estimate is satisfied:*

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \|e\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} &\leq C_1 \|\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} + \underline{a}^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|u_0 - U(0)\| + \|U^d(0)\|) \\ &\quad + C_1 \|U^d\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} + C_2 \|U_t^d\|_{L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(\Omega))}, \end{aligned}$$

with $C_1 := 1 + \sqrt{2\bar{a}\underline{a}}^{-1}$ and $C_2 := \sqrt{2\underline{a}}^{-1}$.

Proof Set $v = e^c$ in (11), to deduce

$$(14) \quad \langle e_t^c, e^c \rangle + \langle \alpha(U^c) - \alpha(u), \nabla e^c \rangle = -\langle U_t^d, e^c \rangle + \langle \alpha(U^c) - \alpha(w), \nabla e^c \rangle.$$

Conditions (3) and (2) imply, respectively,

$$\langle \alpha(U^c) - \alpha(u), \nabla e^c \rangle \geq \underline{a} \|\nabla e^c\|^2, \text{ and } \langle \alpha(U^c) - \alpha(w), \nabla e^c \rangle \leq \bar{a} \|\nabla \epsilon^c\| \|\nabla e^c\|,$$

and the duality pairing (H^{-1}, H_0^1) gives $|\langle U_t^d, e^c \rangle| \leq \|U_t^d\|_{-1} \|\nabla e^c\|$. Using the last 3 relations on (14), we deduce

$$(15) \quad \langle e_t^c, e^c \rangle + \underline{a} \|\nabla e^c\|^2 \leq (\|U_t^d\|_{-1} + \bar{a} \|\nabla \epsilon^c\|) \|\nabla e^c\|,$$

which, in turn, implies

$$(16) \quad \langle e_t^c, e^c \rangle + \frac{\underline{a}}{2} \|\nabla e^c\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\underline{a}} (\|U_t^d\|_{-1} + \bar{a} \|\nabla \epsilon^c\|)^2.$$

Integrating (16) with respect to t between 0 and T , yields

$$\|e^c(t)\|^2 + \underline{a} \int_0^T \|\nabla e^c\|^2 \leq \|e^c(0)\|^2 + \frac{1}{\underline{a}} \int_0^T (\|U_t^d\|_{-1} + \bar{a} \|\nabla \epsilon^c\|)^2,$$

or

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} \left(\int_0^T \|\nabla e^c\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} &\leq \underline{a}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^c(0)\| + \underline{a}^{-1} \left(\int_0^T (\|U_t^d\|_{-1} + \bar{a} \|\nabla \epsilon^c\|)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \underline{a}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e^c(0)\| + C_2 \|U_t^d\|_{L^2(0,T,H^{-1}(\Omega))} \\ &\quad + (C_1 - 1) \|\epsilon^c\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} \end{aligned}$$

noting that $\|\epsilon^c\| = \|\nabla \epsilon^c\|$. Using the bounds $\|\epsilon^c\| \leq \|\epsilon\| + \|U^d\|$, $\|e^c(0)\| \leq \|e(0)\| + \|U^d(0)\|$ on (17) and the resulting bound on the triangle inequality

$$\|e\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} \leq \|\epsilon^c\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))} + \|U^d\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))},$$

yields the result. $\square$

For the above result to yield a formally a posteriori bound, we need to estimate $\|\epsilon\|_{L^2(0,T,H^1(\Omega))}$ further. In particular, in view of Remark 3.2, we require an a posteriori error bound for the IPDG method for the corresponding elliptic quasi-linear problem (9). Such a result is available in [HSW], an instance of which and is presented next.

3.5. Theorem ([HSW]). *Let $w \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ be the elliptic reconstruction defined in (7) and let $W \in S^p$ be the solution of (9). Then, for $C_\sigma > 1$ sufficiently large the bound*

$$(18) \quad \|w - W\|^2 \leq \mathcal{E}(W, g, S^p) := C_{\text{est}} \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\eta_\kappa^2 + \mathcal{O}(g, W) \right),$$

holds, with

$$\eta_\kappa^2 = \frac{h_\kappa^2}{p^2} \|\tilde{\Pi}(g + \nabla \cdot \alpha(W))\|_\kappa^2 + \frac{h_\kappa}{p} \|\tilde{\Pi}_\Gamma[\alpha(W)]\|_{\partial\kappa \setminus \partial\Omega}^2 + C_\sigma^2 \frac{p^3}{h_\kappa} \|W\|_{\partial\kappa}^2,$$

and

$$\mathcal{O}(g, w_{\text{DG}}) = \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\frac{h_\kappa^2}{p^2} \|(\mathbb{I} - \tilde{\Pi})(g + \alpha(W))\|_\kappa^2 + \frac{h_\kappa}{p} \|(\mathbb{I} - \tilde{\Pi}_\Gamma)[\alpha(W)]\|_{\partial\kappa \setminus \partial\Omega}^2 \right),$$

where $\mathbb{I}$ denotes a generic identity operator, $\tilde{\Pi}$ denotes the L^2 -projection operator onto S^{p-1} , $\tilde{\Pi}_\Gamma$ is defined piecewise by $\tilde{\Pi}_\Gamma v|_e := \pi_e^{p-1} v$, for all elemental faces $e \subset \Gamma$, $v \in L^2(\Omega)$, where $\pi_e^{p-1} : L^2(\Omega) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{p-1}(e)$ denotes the L^2 -projection operator of the trace on the face e of a function in S^{p-1} (with $\mathcal{P}_{p-1}(e)$, for $e \subset \bar{\kappa}$ the space of mapped univariate polynomials of degree at most $p-1$ on e), and $C_{\text{est}} > 0$ is independent of C_σ , θ , h and p .

Also, it is possible to further estimate the terms involving U^d , to avoid computing U^d explicitly. This is done (with, crucially, *explicit* dependence on p) using the following result based on [BE07, Lemma 3.2].

3.6. Lemma. *Suppose $\mathcal{T}$ does not contain any hanging nodes. Then, for any $v \in S^p$ and any multi-index γ , with $|\gamma| = 0, 1$, there exists a function $v^c \in S^p \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$ such that*

$$(19) \quad \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \|D^\gamma(v - v^c)\|_\kappa^2 \leq C_3 \left(\frac{h}{p^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} - |\gamma|} \|v\|_\Gamma^2,$$

with $C_3 > 0$ depending on the maximal angle of $\mathcal{T}$ only.

Proof [BE07, Lemma 3.2] implies that for every $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists an Oswald-type operator $I_{\text{Os}} : S^p \rightarrow S^p \cap H_0^1(\Omega)$, such that

$$(20) \quad \|v - I_{\text{Os}} v\|_\kappa^2 \leq C \sum_{e \in \mathcal{F}(\kappa)} \frac{h_\kappa}{p^2} \|v\|_e^2,$$

for all $v \in S^p$, with $\mathcal{F}(\kappa) := \{e \in \Gamma : e \cap \bar{\kappa} \neq \emptyset\}$. Summing over all the elements $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}$, and observing that the maximal angle and the lack of hanging nodes gives an upper bound on the cardinality of $\mathcal{F}(\kappa)$ for all $\kappa \in \mathcal{T}$, we deduce that

$$(21) \quad \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \|v - I_{\text{Os}} v\|_\kappa^2 \leq C \sum_{e \in \Gamma} \frac{h_\kappa}{p^2} \|v\|_e^2,$$

which shows (19) for $|\gamma| = 0$. To show (19) for $|\gamma| = 1$, we observe that $(v - I_{\text{Os}} v) \in S^p$; thus, the standard inverse estimate yields:

$$(22) \quad \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \|\nabla(v - I_{\text{Os}} v)\|_\kappa^2 \leq C \sum_{\kappa \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{p^4}{h_\kappa^2} \|v - I_{\text{Os}} v\|_\kappa^2 \leq C \sum_{e \in \Gamma} \frac{p^2}{h_\kappa} \|v\|_e^2,$$

using the shape regularity of $\mathcal{T}$. Setting $v^c = I_{\text{Os}} v$, the result follows. $\square$

3.7. Remark. The assumptions of Lemma 3.6 pose the following restrictions on the finite element space S^p : the use of quadrilateral elements (as the tensor-product nature of the local elemental bases is of crucial importance here), the exclusion of hanging nodes and the uniformity of the polynomial degree. If explicit knowledge of the polynomial degree p in the a posteriori bounds presented in this work is not required, then these restrictions are not needed in view of [KP03, Lemma 4.1], i.e., triangular elements containing hanging nodes can be employed.

Combining the results of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, together with the approximation properties described in Lemma 3.6, we obtain an a posteriori error bound in the energy norm for the semi-discrete problem (6).

3.8. Theorem (energy-norm a posteriori bound). *With the notation of Theorem 3.4 and the assumptions of Lemma 3.6, the following error bound holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \|e\|_{L^2(0,T;H^1(\Omega))} &\leq C_1 \int_0^T \mathcal{E}^2(U, g, S^p) + \underline{a}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|u_0 - U(0)\| \\
 (23) \quad &+ \underline{a}^{-\frac{1}{2}} C_3 \left\| \left(\frac{h}{p^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} [U(0)] \right\|_{\Gamma}^2 + C_4 \|\sqrt{\sigma}[U]\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))} \\
 &+ C_5 \left\| \left(\frac{h}{p^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} [U_t] \right\|_{L^2(0,T;L^2(\Gamma))},
 \end{aligned}$$

with $C_4 := C_1 \sqrt{C_3/C_\sigma}$, $C_5 := C_2 C_{\text{PF}}$ and $C_{\text{PF}} > 0$ (the Poincaré–Friedrichs constant), such that $\|v\|_{-1} \leq C_{\text{PF}} \|v\|$, for all $v \in L^2(\Omega)$.

Proof Combining the results from Theorems 3.4 and 3.5, together with the approximation properties described in Lemma 3.6, the result follows. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [Arn82] D. N. Arnold, *An interior penalty finite element method with discontinuous elements*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **19** (1982), 742–760.
- [Bak77] Garth A. Baker, *Finite element methods for elliptic equations using nonconforming elements*, Math. Comp. **31** (1977), no. 137, 45–59. MR MR0431742 (55 #4737)
- [BE07] Erik Burman and Alexandre Ern, *Continuous interior penalty hp-finite element methods for advection and advection-diffusion equations*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), no. 259, 1119–1140 (electronic). MR MR2299768
- [BHL03] Roland Becker, Peter Hansbo, and Mats G. Larson, *Energy norm a posteriori error estimation for discontinuous Galerkin methods*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **192** (2003), no. 5-6, 723–733. MR MR1952357 (2003k:65135)
- [EP05] Alexandre Ern and Jennifer Proft, *A posteriori discontinuous Galerkin error estimates for transient convection-diffusion equations*, Appl. Math. Lett. **18** (2005), no. 7, 833–841. MR MR2145454 (2006c:65084)
- [EV09] Alexandre Ern and Martin Vohralík, *A posteriori error estimation based on potential and flux reconstruction for the heat equation*, preprint, CERMICS, Ecole des Ponts, Université Paris-Est, CERMICS, Ecole des Ponts, 77455 Marne la Vallée cedex 2, France, May 2009.
- [GL08] Emmanuil Georgoulis and Omar Lakkis, *A posteriori error control for discontinuous Galerkin methods for parabolic problems*, Preprint submitted 0804.4262, arXiv.org, 2008.
- [HRS05] Paul Houston, Janice Robson, and Endre Süli, *Discontinuous Galerkin finite element approximation of quasilinear elliptic boundary value problems I: The scalar case*, IMA J. Numer. Anal. **25** (2005), 726–749.
- [HSW] Paul Houston, Endre Süli, and Thomas P. Wihler, *A posteriori error analysis of hp-version discontinuous Galerkin finite element methods for second-order quasilinear elliptic problems*, IMA J. Numer. Anal., to appear.
- [HSW07] Paul Houston, Dominik Schötzau, and Thomas P. Wihler, *Energy norm a posteriori error estimation of hp-adaptive discontinuous Galerkin methods for elliptic problems*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **17** (2007), no. 1, 33–62. MR MR2290408
- [KP03] Ohannes A. Karakashian and Frederic Pascal, *A posteriori error estimates for a discontinuous Galerkin approximation of second-order elliptic problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **41** (2003), no. 6, 2374–2399 (electronic). MR MR2034620 (2005d:65192)
- [KP07] ———, *Convergence of adaptive discontinuous Galerkin approximations of second-order elliptic problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **45** (2007), no. 2, 641–665 (electronic). MR MR2300291
- [LM06] Omar Lakkis and Charalambos Makridakis, *Elliptic reconstruction and a posteriori error estimates for fully discrete linear parabolic problems*, Math. Comp. **75** (2006), no. 256, 1627–1658 (electronic). MR MR2240628

- [MN03] Charalambos Makridakis and Ricardo H. Nochetto, *Elliptic reconstruction and a posteriori error estimates for parabolic problems*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **41** (2003), no. 4, 1585–1594 (electronic). MR MR2034895 (2004k:65157)
- [SW05] Shuyu Sun and Mary F. Wheeler, $L^2(H^1)$ norm a posteriori error estimation for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of reactive transport problems, J. Sci. Comput. **22/23** (2005), 501–530. MR MR2142207 (2006b:65132)
- [Whe78] Mary Fanett Wheeler, *An elliptic collocation-finite element method with interior penalties*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **15** (1978), no. 1, 152–161. MR MR0471383 (57 #11117)
- [YC06] Ji-ming Yang and Yan-ping Chen, *A unified a posteriori error analysis for discontinuous Galerkin approximations of reactive transport equations*, J. Comput. Math. **24** (2006), no. 3, 425–434. MR MR2229721 (2006m:65218)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF LEICESTER, UNIVERSITY ROAD, LEICESTER
LE1 7RH, UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `Emmanuil.Georgoulis@mcs.le.ac.uk`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX, FALMER, EAST SUSSEX BN1 9RF,
UNITED KINGDOM

E-mail address: `O.Lakkis@sussex.ac.uk`